```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
                        FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA
 3
      SPEKULATION ORPHAN RELIEF
      TRUST,
 4
                                    ) Case No. 2:23-cv-00014-JAD-BNW
                  Plaintiff,
 5
                                    ) Las Vegas, Nevada
                                   ) October 11, 2023
      vs.
                                    ) 2:40 p.m. - 2:56 p.m.
 6
     NEWREZ LLC d/b/a SHELLPOINT
                                   ) Courtroom 6D
                                   ) MOTION HEARING
 7
     MORTGAGE SERVICING; NEVADA
     LEGAL NEWS, LLC; DOES I
 8
     through X; and ROE BUSINESS
     ENTITIES I through X,
 9
      inclusive,
10
                  Defendants.
                                      CERTIFIED COPY
11
12
                  REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JENNIFER A. DORSEY
13
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
14
15
     APPEARANCES:
     For the Plaintiff: ANDREW BAO, ESQ.
16
                          ANDREW BAO & ASSOCIATES NV
17
                          8020 S. Rainbow Boulevard, Suite 100-163
                          Las Vegas, Nevada 89139
                          (702) 823-4137
18
19
2.0
      (Appearances continued on page 2.)
21
                         Amber M. McClane, RPR, CRR, CCR #914
      Court Reporter:
                         United States District Court
22
                         333 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Room 1334
                         Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
23
                         (702) 384-0429 or AM@nvd.uscourts.gov
24
      Proceedings reported by machine shorthand. Transcript
      produced by computer-aided transcription.
25
```

```
APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
 1
 2
      For the Defendant NewRez LLC:
           ARIEL E. STERN, ESQ.
 3
           AKERMAN LLP
 4
           1635 Village Center Circle, Suite 200
           Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
 5
           (702) 634-5005
 6
      Also present:
 7
           MICHAEL JOHNSON, FHFA
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2023; 2:40 P.M.
2	000
3	PROCEEDINGS
4	COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: Now's the time set for a
5	motions hearing in Case Number 2:23-cv-14-JAD-BNW, Spekulation
6	Orphan Relief Trust versus NewRez, LLC.
7	Counsel, please state your appearances.
8	MR. BAO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Andrew Bao
9	specially appearing for the plaintiff.
10	MR. STERN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Ariel Stern
11	appearing for NewRez, LLC. And with me is my friend and
12	colleague, Mr. Michael Johnson, representative of the Federal
13	Housing Finance Agency.
14	THE COURT: Thank you.
15	Mr. Bao, what do you mean specially appearing?
16	MR. BAO: Just for this hearing, Your Honor.
17	Although I guess I lodged an appearance in this particular
18	case, so I would just be appearing.
19	THE COURT: Just appearing. Okay.
20	MR. BAO: Yeah. Sorry about that.
21	THE COURT: That's all right. Didn't know if we were
22	going back in time 30 years and having a special appearance.
23	MR. BAO: I'm mixing up all these cases.
24	THE COURT: All right. Well, this is one of those
25	second-generation HOA foreclosure cases attempting to prevent

the noteholder from foreclosing on a mortgage that has been in 1 2 default, this one for nearly a decade. The noteholder moves 3 for summary judgment to expunge the lis pendens and to 4 dissolve the preliminary injunction that has stopped the 5 foreclosure from going forward. In the middle -- so we've got motions in the record 6 7 at Numbers 49, 50, and 51. And in the middle of the briefing 8 on these motions the Nevada Supreme Court issued its decision in LV Debt Collect, which really cuts the legs out from under 9 10 the plaintiff's key NRS 106.240 theory. So I then issued an 11 order to show cause why this case should not be dismissed 12 based on that new published Nevada Supreme Court decision. 13 The motions here are fully briefed, and the parties have responded to the order to show cause. I have read 14 15 everything, and I fully understand the arguments. 16 Nevertheless, I'm going to allow each side ten minutes of 17 argument. I'm going to allow Mr. Stern, as the movant, to 18 reserve up to three minutes of that argument for rebuttal. 19 So the podium is yours, sir. 2.0 MR. STERN: Thank you, Your Honor. We will reserve 21 the --22 THE COURT: All three? 23 MR. STERN: Wait until I get up here. Yes, all 24 three. 25 THE COURT: Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. STERN: Thank you, Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And as you, in our view, correctly noted, the $\it LV$ $\it Debt$ decision does cut out the legs of the 106 claim.

Before addressing that, however, Your Honor, I would like to emphasize the importance of the federal statutes, the -- the HERA statutes, and as a -- almost as a factor to illustrate the importance of those issues to Fannie Mae and its conservator, the FHFA, Mr. Johnson is here. And what we emphasize preliminarily but importantly, Your Honor, is that under 4617(f) the Court, just by -- by act of Congress, lacks the authority, like, essentially, the jurisdiction, the power to enjoin the sale. It further lacks the -- the authority to determine as a matter of federal law, before we even get to ${\it LV}$ Debt, that the deed of trust lapsed by operation of the statute -- of the Nevada state statute. With -- a significant overlap, Your Honor, with 4617(j)(3), which directs itself to the specific property of the conservator and preserves the property interest from the operation of the state statute, 106.240, in the manner that the plaintiff requests. And so we emphasize those points as a matter of federal law before we even have to reach LV Debt.

Now, once we do reach $LV\ Debt$, under 106.240 claim we believe the -- the Supreme Court has made it clear beyond really any ability of the plaintiff to get out of that the --

THE COURT: Well, they sure try.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2:23-cv-00014-JAD-BNW - October 11, 2023

They do and this is -- you mentioned MR. STERN: generation two case. Some of these are actually gen three cases where they continue to come at us, we believe --THE COURT: In a Whac-A-Mole style? MR. STERN: Whatever -- whatever theory may present itself, they will latch on to. We were kind of surprised that LV Debt didn't just resolve everything, and -- but we do think it does. And we will just emphasize that, as a matter of title, as a matter of the record, the acts that supposedly create the acceleration that triggers the statute not only are not within the ten years, they aren't even sufficient to trigger the applicability of the statute. Because we're not looking at acceleration; we're looking at the furthest possible point in the future in which the deed of trust, by its own terms or any recorded extension of it, can be by operation essentially not in the -- the term is not in the statute but essentially an ancient mortgage statute. It's more of a recordkeeping statute to clear clearly lapsed mortgages, and that's not what we're dealing with here. Your Honor, with respect to the other claim, 107.200, we emphasize the -- the record that we have provided through the affidavit of the NewRez representative attesting to the timeliness of -- of the receipt of the notice and emphasize

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Amber McClane, RPR, CRR, CCR #914

for the Court's consideration not only the federal

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2:23-cv-00014-JAD-BNW - October 11, 2023

prohibitions against restraint -- in other words, that the availability of -- that there is no available injunctive remedy for 107.200 as a matter of federal preemptive law, we also just don't -- or I should say the plaintiff does not sufficiently provide any contrary evidence showing that there is a claim here to be had for damages or to show that 107.200 applies. But, Your Honor, to the extent that there is some issue remaining for them, we just emphasize that a lot of the information that 107.200 guarantees to a -- to a titleholder seeking to clear a lien already, the plaintiff already has. They know who holds the note. That's not a matter of controversy. In fact, this Court in a previous action has confirmed that it's Fannie Mae and its conservator, the FHFA. That's not really subject to any dispute. The amount -- the other critical piece is the amount that's owed, which is the information the titleholder needs to prevent a foreclosure. That's -- that's a matter of public record. It's disclosed in the notice of sale. And so this

that's owed, which is the information the titleholder needs to prevent a foreclosure. That's -- that's a matter of public record. It's disclosed in the notice of sale. And so this really is one of those cases where there's just no dispute. The claims do not survive the summary judgment, and as ancillary remedies we ask that the Court dissolve the injunction. It's -- if the Court decides that defense is entitled to summary judgment, it just naturally follows that the injunction is dissolved and, likewise, the lis pendens needs to be cleared as another ancillary remedy. And so while

those two ancillary remedies are there, the focus of our 1 2 request for relief is on the merits, on the substance of the 3 HERA statutes as well as LV Debt and just the plaintiff's 4 failure to show any evidence to sustain beyond summary 5 judgment a 107.200 claim. Thank you, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: 7 Thank you so much. Mr. Bao. 8 MR. BAO: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 10 From plaintiff's perspective, Your Honor, the 11 interpretation of LV Debt is set forth in the papers. I'd 12 just like to emphasize for the Court that, from plaintiff's 13 perspective, LV Debt stops short of simply stating that the 14 maturity date of the deed of trust is the trigger date for the ten years. If that case had -- if LV Debt had stood for that 15 16 position expressly, all of these cases would be gone. 17 Plaintiff submits to this Court that LV Debt stops short of 18 making that statement and that -- and that plaintiff's theory 19 that the acceleration occurred prior to the notice of default is still sustainable despite LV Debt's holding. 2.0 21 As to 104, Your Honor, I didn't know that was still 22 at issue, but if it is, we can -- plaintiff will dismiss 23 that -- that claim. 107.200, it revolves around the defendants not 24 25 responding to the --

THE COURT: Hold on. Back up. As to 104 you didn't 1 know that was still at issue, what are we talking about? 2 3 MR. BAO: The owner of the note theory, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Oh. Okay. 5 MR. BAO: Yeah. THE COURT: Oh. 6 7 MR. BAO: If that is still alive in this case, 8 plaintiff will voluntarily dismiss that. THE COURT: Okay. 9 10 MR. BAO: And unless the Court has questions, 11 Your Honor -- I know the Court is very familiar with these 12 cases -- plaintiff would submit on its papers. 13 THE COURT: Thank you so much. I don't have any 14 questions. 15 MR. BAO: Thank you. 16 Mr. Stern, rebuttal. 17 MR. STERN: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 Just to emphasize that -- in Mr. Bao's response there 19 was no challenge to the applicability of the federal HERA 2.0 statutes as set forth in our papers. And other than that, 21 ready to submit, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. 23 It is my intention to rule on this motion on the 24 record today. I will place my findings and conclusions on the 25 record, and the transcript of this hearing will serve as the

2.0

2:23-cv-00014-JAD-BNW - October 11, 2023

record of my ruling. This does take just a bit of time, so please bear with me.

We're all familiar with the legal standards governing summary judgment. They are well settled under both FRCP 56(a) and the *Celotex* case. A party is entitled to summary judgment when the movant shows there's no genuine issue as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. And here I find that standard is satisfied.

Let me walk through the arguments. I'm going to start with the key one here at the NRS 106.240 ancient lien statute argument. This is one of those -- as -- as I sort of inferred during Mr. Stern's argument, the HOA cases have been subject to an interesting phenomenon, which is every time the Nevada Supreme Court comes out with a published opinion that kills one of the theories for the homeowners who purchased these properties through the foreclosure process, another new argument crops up somewhere. Again, as I refer to it, the Whac-A-Mole theory of HOA litigation.

This NRS 106.240 theory is one that came up about two-ish years ago, and the LV Debt Collect case killed it.

And so, Mr. Bao, I appreciate your interpretation of it and its reach and its impact on your client's theories here, but I disagree. I think that this case is very clear, and it really put a nail in that argument for you and your clients. That case, LV Debt Collect, it's 534 P.3d 693, and it truly does

2.0

2:23-cv-00014-JAD-BNW - October 11, 2023

resolve the issue. So I don't even reach the HERA issue, the 47 -- the 4617 issues here, because I think the *LV Debt*Collect is clear, and it leaves no question.

Also, to accelerate a debt requires an acceleration be so clear and unequivocal that it leaves no doubt as to the lender's intention, and there's just nothing in this record that does that with respect to the sort of new theory that came up in response to my order to show cause; that it's an unrecorded additional document that's somewhere floating out that we really can't identify. That just wouldn't do it either. So there's just nothing in this record to support that theory.

And I find that the plaintiff's efforts to distinguish this case from LV Debt Collect or to argue that it actually is a case that benefits plaintiffs like Spekulation are, to put it bluntly, just nonsensical at this point. So the NRS 106.240 clock just hasn't started in this case.

The plaintiff has moved to dismiss and abandoned the theory that Shellpoint isn't in possession of the note or isn't its owner, so I don't need to address that one.

And that brings me or leaves me with the NRS 107.200 violation claim which I find fails as a matter of law and fact. Even if the plaintiff timely served a request in compliance with the statute -- and this record definitely suggests that did not happen. Nevertheless, there's no

evidence in the record to show a willful violation by 1 2 Shellpoint. Plus, the remedy for such a claim is an award of 3 damages. It doesn't form the basis for a quiet title or 4 injunctive relief claim as it's pled here. 5 So with no viable claim, I grant the motion for 6 summary judgment on all claims and theories. I direct the 7 Clerk of Court to enter judgment on all claims against the 8 plaintiff, dissolve the preliminary injunction, and expunge 9 the lis pendens. 10 Did I miss anything? 11 MR. STERN: No, Your Honor. But if I might, I 12 understand this -- you will not require a -- an order 13 submitted from NewRez? THE COURT: 14 That's right. 15 MR. STERN: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 Your Honor, as Mr. Johnson reminds me, since we 17 actually have to record in the county recorder --18 THE COURT: There will be a judgment. The Clerk of 19 Court will enter a judgment. MR. STERN: Um-hum. So we would record a notice of 2.0 21 entry of the judgment, and the judgment will specify that the 22 lis pendens has been expunged? 23 THE COURT: Yes. Danielle, can we make sure that happens? Okay. That the judgment will also state that the 24 25 preliminary injunction is dissolved and that the lis pendens

1	is expunged.
2	MR. STERN: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Does that cover it?
4	MR. STERN: Yeah, that should cover it.
5	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bao, any questions?
6	MR. BAO: None, Your Honor. Thank you.
7	THE COURT: All right. Thanks, everyone. We're
8	adjourned.
9	(Proceedings adjourned at 2:56 p.m.)
10	000
11	COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
12	
13	I, AMBER M. McCLANE, Official Court Reporter, United
14	States District Court, District of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada,
15	do hereby certify that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 753 the
16	foregoing is a true, complete, and correct transcript of the
17	proceedings had in connection with the above-entitled matter.
18	
19	DATED: 2/20/2024
20	
21	/s/ Amber M. McClane AMBER McCLANE, RPR, CRR, CCR #914
22	=====, ====, ====, ====, ====, ====, ====, ====, =====, ======
23	
24	
2.5	